

REMARKS

This application was originally filed on 11 August 2000 with three claims, all of which were written in independent form. No claims have been allowed. Claims 4-9 have been added by this amendment.

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,986,640 to Baldwin *et al.* ("Baldwin"). The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baldwin does not show, teach, or suggest "dividing an image frame period into at least two refresh periods" and "displaying said first image data bit during some, but not all, of said refresh periods" as recited by Claim 1.

The Examiner stated, "Baldwin teaches a method of displaying an image where the image frame period is divided in two (column 6, line 59) and shy then some of the bit data are displayed in some, if not all, of the refresh and other bits are displayed more of the refresh period (figures 6a-6e and column 6, lines 58-62)."

Baldwin, in Figures 6a-6e and lines 54-62 of column 6, clearly teaches merely splitting the display period of one or more bit periods and distributing the bit periods throughout the single frame period.

Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Baldwin. The applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baldwin does not show, teach, or suggest "dividing a frame period into at least two refresh periods; allocating a display period to each image data bit in an m-bit image data word; determining the a minimum temporal frequency for each of said image data bits, said minimum temporal frequency necessary to prevent each said image data bit from appearing to flicker; and displaying each said image data bit in enough of said refresh periods to achieve said minimum temporal frequency, wherein not all of said image data bits are displayed in all of said refresh periods" as recited by Claim 2.

As argued above with respect to Claim 1, Baldwin, in Figures 6a-6e and lines 54-62 of column 6, clearly teaches merely splitting the display period of one or more bit periods and distributing the bit periods throughout the single frame period.

Claim 3 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a) as being anticipated by Baldwin. The

applicant respectfully disagrees.

Baldwin does not show, teach, or suggest "a controller for receiving image data and processing said image data, said image data comprised of m image bits for each pixel of an image, said processing allocating a series of refresh periods to said image bits such that not all of said image bits are displayed in the same number of said refresh periods; and a display device in electrical communication with said controller, said display device for providing a modulated light beam to each of an array of image pixels, said modulation in response to said processed image data from said controller" as recited by Claim 3.

As argued above with respect to Claim 1, Baldwin, in Figures 6a-6e and lines 54-62 of column 6, clearly teaches merely splitting the display period of one or more bit periods and distributing the bit periods throughout the single frame period.

In view of the amendments and the remarks presented herewith, it is believed that the claims currently in the application accord with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. § 112 and are allowable over the prior art of record. Therefore, it is urged that the pending claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Charles A. Brill
Reg. No. 37,786

Texas Instruments Incorporated
PO Box 655474 M/S 3999
Dallas, TX 75265
(972) 917-4379
FAX: (972) 917-4418